



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/629,376	07/28/2003	Qiang He	14565.0014US01	6537
6537	7590	01/15/2009	EXAMINER	
ATOCHEM PATENT DEPARTMENT LA DEFENSE 10 CEDEX 42 92091 PARIS FRANCE, 111111111 FRANCE			WILSON, ROBERT W	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2419	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			01/15/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/629,376	Applicant(s) HE ET AL.	
	Examiner ROBERT W. WILSON	Art Unit 2419	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11/03/08.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-25 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8, 11, 14, 17, 20 and 23 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 9, 10, 12, 13, 15, 16, 18, 19, 21, 22, 24 and 25 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hendel (U.S. Patent No.: 5,920,566) in view of McCollom (U.S. Patent Pub. No.: 2003/0120769) further in view of Internetworking with TCP/IP Principles, Protocols, and Architecture by Douglas E. Comer henceforth referred to as Comer.

Referring to claim 1, Hendel teaches: A method for forwarding multicast message in a network communication (The MLDNE per Fig 2 performs the method) comprising:

a. establishing a forwarding match condition at an ingress interface of a network device required to forward multicast message the forwarding match condition specifying a multicast forwarding rule for the multicast message, the multicast forwarding rule having a message forwarding destination specified therein (The multicast router value per Fig 3 is used by 210 per Fig 2 is an ingress interface in the MLDNE or network device. The ingress interface has a number of parameters in Fig 3 which are established in a table in the ingress interface to determine if the message is a unicast or multicast message and also whether the multicast message should be forwarded. The parameters include MAC destination address as well as layer 3 source address, layer 3 destination address, inbound port, multicast route, class, and multicast route per Fig 3 per col. 11 lines 25 to 42)

b. comparing a multicast message which enter the network device through the interface and needs to be forwarded with the established forwarding condition (The ingress interface examines compares the layer 3 source address, layer3 destination, source port, destination port, inbound port and multicast route in order determine if the message is multicast message per col. 11 lines 25 to 42)

c. forwarding the multicast message according to the comparing result (If the message is a multicast message then the message is forwarded per col. 11 lines 25 to 42).

Hendel does not expressly call for: rule designated by a user

Art Unit: 2419

McCollom teaches: rule designated by a user (Administrator or user configures or designated a policy or rule to a router or MLDNE per Pg 4 Para[0035])

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to add the rule designated by the user of McCollom to the system of Hendel in order for the system to be configured or provisioned.

The combination of Hendel and McCollum do not expressly call for: forwarding multicast message independent of routing forwarding table

Comer teaches: forwarding multicast message independent of routing forwarding table (Ethernet interface receives a packet with all ones which designates broadcasting to all nodes. A broadcast is a special kind of multicast message which does not require looking up a destination in a routing table because the message is sent to all nodes; thus, this message would inherently be sent to all nodes without having to look up destinations in the routing table per Para 2.4.9 Pg 29-30)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to add the forwarding multicast message independent of routing forwarding table of Comer to the multicast processing of the combination of Hendel and McCollum in order to build a system which can send a message to all nodes.

3. Claims 2-8, 11, 14, 17, 20 & 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hendel (U.S. Patent No.: 5,920,566) in view of McCollom (Patent Pub. No.: 2003/0120769) in view of Comer further in view of Pitcher (U.S. Patent No: 6,370,142)

Referring to claim 2, the combination of Hendel, McCollom, and Comer teach: a method of forwarding multicast message in network communication of claim 1 and Hendel teaches the match forwarding condition when the multicast group address matches.

The combination of Hendel, Comer, McCollom do not expressly call for: wherein said forwarding match condition is a multicast message forwarding rule consisting of more than one multicast forwarding rule

Pitcher teaches: wherein said forwarding match condition is a multicast message forwarding rule consisting of more than one multicast forwarding rule (What to do if the multicast group address does not match the forwarding table then the multicast message is forwarded to ports based upon a report destination list associated router which have previously sent multicast packets per col. 9 lines 51 to 67)

Art Unit: 2419

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to add the second multicast rule of Pitcher to the first rule of the combination of Hendel, McCollom, and Comer in order to build a system which can process unrecognized multicast addresses.

In addition Hendel teaches:

Regarding claim 3, wherein step b comprises:

b1. determining whether the message entering the interface is a multicast message (210 per Fig 2 is an ingress interface in the MLDNE or network device. The ingress interface examines the MAC destination address as well as layer 3 source address, layer 3 destination address, inbound port, multicast route, and class fields in the packet to their counterpart values shown in Fig 3 for a type 2 in order to determine if the message is a multicast message s per col. 11 lines 25 to 42)

b2. if the message entering through the interface is a multicast message comparing the multicast message with individual multicast message forwarding rules contained the forwarding match condition (If the message parameters match then the message is determined to be a multicast message then the message or packet is forwarded per col. col. 11 line 1 to col. 12 line 7)

Regarding claim 4, wherein step b2 comprises step of comparing the source address information in the multicast message with source address information in the multicast message forwarding rule (The ingress interface examines the MAC destination address as well as layer 3 source address per Fig 3 and per col. 11 lines 25 to 42)

Regarding claim 5, wherein said step b2 comprises the step of comparing the source address and destination address information in the multicast message with the source address and destination address information in the multicast message forwarding rule (The ingress interface examines the MAC destination address as well as layer 3 source address and layer 3 destination address per Fig 3 and per col. 11 lines 25 to 42)

Regarding claim 6, wherein said step b2 comprises step of comparing the ingress interface information in the multicast message with the ingress information in the multicast message forwarding rule (The ingress interface examines the MAC destination address as well as inbound port per Fig 3 and per col. 11 lines 25 to 42)

Referring to claim 7, the combination of Hendel, McCollom, and Pitcher teach: the method for forwarding multicast message of claim 3 and Hendel teaches: wherein step b2 comprises:

b21. determining whether there is a multicast message forwarding rule established at the interface of the network device comparing information compared by the multicast message with

Art Unit: 2419

corresponding information in the multicast message forwarding rule (recognizing the multicast message and forwarding per col. 11 lines 25 to 42)

b22. if there is a multicast message forwarding rule established at the interface of the network device comparing information carried by the multicast message with corresponding information in the multicast message forwarding rule (comparing the multicast group address to determine forwarding to per col. 11 lines 25 to 42) ;

The combination of Hendel, Comer, and McCollom do not expressly call for: b23. if not multicast message forwarding rule is established at the interface of the network device forwarding the multicast message according to a multicast routing forwarding table (What to do if the multicast group address does not match the forwarding table then the multicast message is forwarded to ports based upon a report destination list associated router which have previously sent multicast packets per col. 9 lines 51 to 67)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to add the second multicast rule of Pitcher to the system of the combination of Hendel, McCollom, Comer and Pitcher in order to build a system which can process unrecognized multicast addresses.

Referring to claim 8, Hendel, McCollom, Comer, and Pitcher teach: the method for forwarding multicast message in a network communication of claim 2, Hendel teaches wherein said step c comprises:

c1. determining whether there is a multicast message forwarding rule information carried by the multicast message in the forwarding match condition (recognizing the multicast message and forwarding per match condition per col. 11 lines 25 to 42)

c2. if there is a multicast message forwarding rule established at the interface of the network device comparing information carried by the multicast message with corresponding information in the multicast message forwarding rule (If there is known multicast group destination address then the packet is forwarded per col. 11 lines 25 to 42)

The combination of Hendel, McCollom, and Comer do not expressly call for: c3. if not multicast message forwarding rule is established at the interface of the network device forwarding the multicast message according to a multicast routing forwarding table

Pitcher teaches: c3. if not multicast message forwarding rule is established at the interface of the network device forwarding the multicast message according to a multicast routing forwarding table (If the multicast group message address is not recognized then forwarding the packet based upon destination list or table per col. 9 lines 51 to 67)

Art Unit: 2419

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to add the second multicast rule of Pitcher to the system of Hendel, McCollom, Comer, and Pitcher in order to build a system which can process unrecognized multicast addresses.

Referring to claim 11, the combination of Hendel, McCollom, Comer, and Pitcher teach: a method for forwarding multicast message in a network communication of claim 3 and Hendel teaches: wherein step c comprises:

c1. determining whether there is a multicast message forwarding rule matching the information carried by the multicast message in the forwarding match condition (determining if is a match for a multicast message per Fig 3)

c2. if there is a multicast message forwarding rule established at the interface of the network device comparing information carried by the multicast message with corresponding information in the multicast message forwarding rule; (If there is a match then forwarding the packet)

The combination of Hendel, McCollom, and Comer do not expressly call for: c3. if not multicast message forwarding rule is established at the interface of the network device forwarding the multicast message according to a multicast routing forwarding table

Pitcher teaches: c3. if not multicast message forwarding rule is established at the interface of the network device forwarding the multicast message according to a multicast routing forwarding table (If the multicast group message address is not recognized then forwarding the packet based upon destination list or table per col. 9 lines 51 to 67)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to add the second multicast rule of Pitcher to the system of Hendel, McCollom, Comer, and Pitcher in order to build a system which can process unrecognized multicast addresses.

Referring to claim 14, the combination of Hendel, McCollom, Comer, and Pitcher teach: a method for forwarding multicast message in network communication of claim 4 and Hendel teaches wherein step c comprises:

c1. determining whether there is a multicast message forwarding rule matching the information carried by the multicast message in the forwarding match condition (determining if is a match for a multicast message per Fig 3)

c2. if there is a multicast message forwarding rule established at the interface of the network device comparing information carried by the multicast message with corresponding information in the multicast message forwarding rule; (If there is a match then forwarding the packet)

Art Unit: 2419

The combination of Hendel, McCollom, and Comer do not expressly call for: c3. if not multicast message forwarding rule is established at the interface of the network device forwarding the multicast message according to a multicast routing forwarding table

Pitcher teaches: c3. if not multicast message forwarding rule is established at the interface of the network device forwarding the multicast message according to a multicast routing forwarding table (If the multicast group message address is not recognized then forwarding the packet based upon destination list or table per col. 9 lines 51 to 67)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to add the second multicast rule of Pitcher to the system of Hendel, McCollom, Comer, and Pitcher in order to build a system which can process unrecognized multicast addresses.

Referring to claim 17, the combination of Hendel, McCollom, Comer, and Pitcher teach: a method for forwarding multicast message in network communication in claim 5, and Hendel teaches: wherein step c comprises:

c1. determining whether there is a multicast message forwarding rule matching the information carried by the multicast message in the forwarding match condition (determining if is a match for a multicast message per Fig 3)

c2. if there is a multicast message forwarding rule established at the interface of the network device comparing information carried by the multicast message with corresponding information in the multicast message forwarding rule; (If there is a match then forwarding the packet)

The combination of Hendel, McCollom, and Comer do not expressly call for: c3. if not multicast message forwarding rule is established at the interface of the network device forwarding the multicast message according to a multicast routing forwarding table

Pitcher teaches: c3. if not multicast message forwarding rule is established at the interface of the network device forwarding the multicast message according to a multicast routing forwarding table (If the multicast group message address is not recognized then forwarding the packet based upon destination list or table per col. 9 lines 51 to 67)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to add the second multicast rule of Pitcher to the system of Hendel, McCollom, Comer, and Pitcher in order to build a system which can process unrecognized multicast addresses.

Referring to claim 20, the combination of Hendel, McCollom, Comer, and Pitcher teach: a method for forwarding multicast message in network communication of claim 6 Hendel teaches: wherein said step c comprises:

Art Unit: 2419

c1. determining whether there is a multicast message forwarding rule matching the information carried by the multicast message in the forwarding match condition (determining if is a match for a multicast message per Fig 3)

c2. if there is a multicast message forwarding rule established at the interface of the network device comparing information carried by the multicast message with corresponding information in the multicast message forwarding rule; (If there is a match then forwarding the packet)

The combination of Hendel, McCollom, and Comer do not expressly call for: c3. if not multicast message forwarding rule is established at the interface of the network device forwarding the multicast message according to a multicast routing forwarding table

Pitcher teaches: c3. if not multicast message forwarding rule is established at the interface of the network device forwarding the multicast message according to a multicast routing forwarding table (If the multicast group message address is not recognized then forwarding the packet based upon destination list or table per col. 9 lines 51 to 67)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to add the second multicast rule of Pitcher to the system of Hendel, McCollom, Comer, and Pitcher in order to build a system which can process unrecognized multicast addresses.

Referring to claim 23, the combination of Hendel, McCollom, Comer, and Pitcher teach: a method for forwarding multicast message in network communication of claim 7 and Hendel teaches wherein step c comprises:

c1. determining whether there is a multicast message forwarding rule matching the information carried by the multicast message in the forwarding match condition (determining if is a match for a multicast message per Fig 3)

c2. if there is a multicast message forwarding rule established at the interface of the network device comparing information carried by the multicast message with corresponding information in the multicast message forwarding rule; (If there is a match then forwarding the packet)

The combination of Hendel, McCollom, and Comer do not expressly call for: c3. if not multicast message forwarding rule is established at the interface of the network device forwarding the multicast message according to a multicast routing forwarding table

Pitcher teaches: c3. if not multicast message forwarding rule is established at the interface of the network device forwarding the multicast message according to a multicast routing forwarding table (If the multicast group message address is not recognized then forwarding the packet based upon destination list or table per col. 9 lines 51 to 67)

Art Unit: 2419

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to add the second multicast rule of Pitcher to the system of Hendel, McCollom, Comer, and Pitcher in order to build a system which can process unrecognized multicast addresses.

Claim Objections

4. Claims 12-13, 15-16, 18-19, 21-22, & 24-25 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Response to Amendment

5. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-25 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Please refer to the above rejection for details.

6. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Conclusion

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to ROBERT W. WILSON whose telephone number is (571)272-3075. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (8:00-4:30).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jay Patel can be reached on 571/272-2988. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Robert W Wilson/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2419

RWW
1/9/09